

5th March 1925]

- (d) whether any members of this community applied for being nominated at the time the last set of nominations was made; and
(e) if so, the reasons for not appointing one of them?

A.—Members of taluk boards are appointed by the President of the District Board. The Government have no information.

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Should the Government take no responsibility to see that these local bodies are exercising their right of nomination equitably as regards unrepresented classes? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The Government have been occasionally issuing instructions to the district boards as to the representation of various communities. Discretion is left to the Presidents of District Boards. The matter is one to be considered by them.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ Since this particular case has been brought to the notice of the department, would it not be better if the attention of the local bodies concerned is drawn to them? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ If particular instances are brought to the notice of the Government, they will have no objection to issue instructions to the Presidents.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ In view of the fact that a large number of nominations have to be made, will not the Government think it necessary to issue general instructions reminding presidents of local bodies of their duties? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The request will be considered.”

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR :—“ In view of the remarks of the hon. the Chief Minister, will the Government be so good as to enquire into this particular matter I have referred to? ”

Censure on the Trichinopoly municipal council.

* 379 Q.—Mr. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government ascertained from the municipal council of Trichinopoly the truth of the allegations before they passed G.O. No. 609, L. & M., dated 7th March 1924, censuring the municipal council; if not, why not;

(b) whether it is a fact that, when the Inspector of municipal councils inspected the Trichinopoly municipality between the 11th and 16th of April 1924, the then chairman requested the Inspector to give him an opportunity of presenting an explanation of the alleged objectionable points in his administration and that the Inspector gave the chairman an assurance that he would do so;

(c) whether it is a fact that the entire correspondence regarding the administration of the Trichinopoly municipality beginning from G.O. No. 609, L. & M., and ending with chairman's explanations therefor was asked by the municipal council of Trichinopoly to be placed on the table of that council; and

(d) if so, whether the chairman has placed them before the council and at what time?

[5th March 1925]

A.—(a) The Government made no reference to the council on the subject.
The Government relied on the report of the Chairman.

(b) No.

(c) & (d) The Government have no information.

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ Will the hon. the Minister kindly explain the answer given in clause (a) of the answer? It is not clear whether the G.O. did not refer to the administration at all? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ What was meant by this was that the Government did not make any reference to the council. ”

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ May I read out the very words of the Government Order? ‘ The Municipal Council was characterized by long and discursive discussions and indiscriminate calls for statistics which involved delay in carrying on the municipal administration, etc. ’ Do not these references clearly show that the Council was at fault? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The Government did not think that the council was at fault. ”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask why the Government say they did not pass any censure on the council when they say it was characterized by long speeches? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ They did not think it necessary. ”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ May I ask then the reasons why the Government did not make a reference to the Council asking it to explain before they passed judgment upon them? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I do not think that, in a case like this, the Government should ask the council before they pass a Government Order. ”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ In the second line of the answer it is said that the Government relied on the report of the Chairman. May I ask the hon. the Minister whether the report of the Chairman contained any statement with regard to the charges about the discussions in the Council itself? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I know that there are general charges against the Council. Most of the charges were practically in the printed report of the Chairman. ”

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ Did the Government ascertain the truth of the allegations made by the Chairman about the council? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The Government did ascertain from the special officer. ”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ What did they ascertain? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ They ascertained that the allegations were not correct. ”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ In clause (b) of the question there are two parts, viz., whether the Chairman requested and the Inspector gave an assurance. Does the answer apply to both the parts? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Yes. ”

5th March 1925]

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ With regard to the answer to clauses (c) and (d), may I point that there was some correspondence between the Secretary and the Chairman about the placing of the papers before the council ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The answer is in the negative.”

Recording of the minutes of the Trichinopoly municipal council proceedings.

* 380 Q.—MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether any clear case of inaccurate recording of the minutes of the proceedings of the Trichinopoly municipal council by the chairman, Mr. F. G. Natesa Ayyar, has been brought to the notice of the Government ;

(b) if so, what action the Government have taken against the Chairman ; and

(c) if not, why the Government cannot expunge that remark from the report of the Inspector of Municipalities ?

A.—(a) The answer is in the affirmative.

(b) The Government passed an order severely criticising the action of the Chairman.

(c) The question does not arise.

MR. MUHAMMAD GHOUSE MIAN SAHIB :—“ May I know the nature of the record ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ I cannot say that offhand.”

MR. P. L. MOORE :—“ The record is that the budget was presented when it was not so done.”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Was the Chairman asked to explain, and if so, what was his explanation ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ The Chairman himself gave explanation. It was not satisfactory so far as the charges were concerned.”

MR. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Besides that case, were there other cases ? ”

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ My impression is that there were.”

Proposed abolition of Rayadrug taluk board.

* 381 Q.—MR. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state, with reference to answer to clause (b) of question No. 1377, dated 4th December 1924, whether the Government have been since in receipt of the views of the district board of Bellary regarding the abolition of the Rayadrug taluk board and, if so, when ?

A.—The views of the district board were received on the 14th November 1924. A copy ^a is laid on the table.

^a Printed as Appendix II on page 877 infra.